REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed February 13, 2009. This

Response addresses each of the issues raised by the examiner in the Office Action. This

Response accompanies a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE), along with an

Interview Request Form. Applicant hereby requests an interview with Examiner at the

Examiner's earliest convenience to discuss this application. Entry of this Response and

reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-17, 20, 23-30 and 32-34 are pending in the prosecution of this application.

Claim 29 has been amended in this Response.

Claims 1-17, 20, 23-30, and 32-34 were rejected in the Office Action under §103 as

being unpatentable over Meyer, Van Dort, Silver, and further evidenced by Matrix Vision.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 29 was objected to because the claim fails to

terminate in the proper punctuation. Accordingly, claim 29 has been amended to now have

proper punctuation. This objection is believed to have now been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-17, 20, 23-30 and 32-34 were rejected under

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer, Van Dort and Silver, and further evidenced by Matrix

Vision. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

By way of background, applicant claims a system for initiating communication between a

user interface (UI) and a vision processor (VP). A method is claimed and described for

instructing a UI in communication with a first VP to establish communication with a second VP. The prior art references, neither alone or in combination, teach the system and method in the manner as claimed by applicant.

On Page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 1, specifically indicating that Meyer teaches "enabling a continually updated image display on the at least one distinct and separate machine vision UI representing a current state of the any second distinct and separate VP connected to the network." In support of this rejection, Examiner points to Meyer, at column 6, lines 10-18, which discusses "live image views." The "live image views" of Van Dort are vastly different from the "continually updated image display" as claimed, and thus, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The "live image views" of Van Dort are analogous to that of a real-world 35 mm camera, as discussed by Van Dort in column 5, lines 60-62. Thus, a predetermined number of individual image frames are captured by the camera to be grabbed by the user. This is in direct contrast to a continual image display as claimed, which provides current state information on a continual basis about a particular VP. Applicant asserts that the "live image views" of Van Dort are merely a set of frames and are not continual.

Additionally, Applicant claims that the image display represents "a current state of the any second distinct and separate VP connected to the network." In rejecting the claim, Examiner has associated Applicant's vision processors with the cameras of Van Dort. However, the "live image views" provided by the cameras are do not provide the current view of the <u>camera</u>, as would be required by the claim language (i.e. "continually updated image display" representing a "current state" of the VP). They instead provide information about the object being imaged by

the camera, not the live image as captured in real-time by the camera itself. This is vastly different from Applicant's claimed feature, which provides current state information about a vision processor to provide a live image.

It is conceded by the Examiner, on page 3 of the Office Action, that the Meyer reference fails to teach a "link function being a control function executable by the first distinct and separate VP," and "executing the link function so as to issue instructions from the first distinct and separate VP to the distinct and separate machine vision UI to establish communication via the network with any second distinct and separate VP." Accordingly, the Van Dort reference is relied upon as teaching the execution of the link function so as to "issue instructions from the first VP to the UI". However, the Van Dort reference does not provide a link function in the manner as claimed by applicant, and thus also does not execute the link function in the manner as claimed by applicant.

As stated in the last full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, the Van Dort reference teaches a plurality of units that allow for the control of audio and video equipment. The "equipment units" referred to in Van Dort are merely audio and/or video equipment, i.e. devices that can be controlled according to messages on a communication channel. However, the Van Dort reference teaches a plurality of actuator units that may send messages into the communication channel to switch or adjust an equipment unit. There is no contemplation in the Van Dort reference of the "equipment units" (i.e. audio and video equipment) executing a control function to issue instructions <u>from</u> the unit to establish communication with a second VP, as claimed by applicant.

Conversely, as described in column 5, lines 50-64, each actuator unit has a predetermined number of equipment units (i.e. audio/video equipment) assigned to that actuator unit. If an actuator changes state (i.e. a switch turns on or off), messages are transmitted to the address of the equipment unit. This does not disclose, teach, or suggest "executing a link function so as to issue instructions from a first VP to a UI to establish communication with a second VP" as claimed by applicant. Instead, Van Dort teaches communication from an actuator unit to other equipment units. There is no contemplation in Van Dort of a vision processor issuing instructions to another vision processor. Instead, "actuator units" (i.e. switches, sensors, timers and remote control units – see col. 1, l. 25-28) issue instructions to "equipment units" (i.e. audio and video equipment). There is no contemplation of the audio and/or video equipment of Van Dort issuing instructions to other equipment units, particularly to "establish communication with a second distinct and separate VP," as claimed by applicant. Conversely, Van Dort teaches the actuator units as issuing instructions to the equipment units, by merely sending a message to the units. This does not teach communication between the UI and the VPs, as claimed by applicant.

Accordingly, even if the Van Dort and Meyer references could be combined, the combined teachings would not obtain a machine vision system wherein VPs may send link functions capable of changing the state of other VPs. There is no contemplation in either reference of a VP sending a link function capable of changing the state of other VPs.

Furthermore, with respect to the Silver reference, it merely teaches a computer that communicates with a machine vision tool computer and an imaging computer via a network. A review of col. 2, line 50 through col. 3, line 15, did not reveal a discussion of multiple vision processors. In fact, a review of the Silver reference revealed discussion of only one "image

acquiring device". Accordingly, Silver does not teach the communication of a plurality of VPs and a UI over a network. Instead, it teaches a machine vision tool, image acquiring device, and display, in the form of a web browser, in communication over a network. Even if combined with the teachings of Meyer and Van Dort, it does not result in applicant's machine vision system as claimed.

Applicant asserts, based on the foregoing remarks, that the claims are not rendered obvious by the prior art, and respectfully requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejections in the Office Action.

Should any unresolved issues remain that require, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney for applicant at 603-336-3026 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Please charge any fee or fee deficiency that is otherwise unpaid to Deposit Account Number 504479.

<div align="right">

Respectfully Submitted,

William A. Loginov
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 34863

</div>

William A. Loginov
10 Water Street
Concord, NH 03301-4844
Tel. 603-336-3026